
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 March 2020

by M Scriven BA (Hons) MSc CMgr MCIHT MCMI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 April 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/20/3244196

148 London Road, Datchet, Slough SL3 9LH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Atwal against the decision of Council of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref 19/02223, dated 8 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 23 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension with part single, part double storey back extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side extension with part single, part double storey back extension at 148 London Road, Datchet, Slough SL3 9LH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/02223, dated 8 August 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: P101, P102, P103, P104, P105, E101 and E102.

Procedural matters

2. The description of the development, which comes from the application form differs to the plans submitted and subsequent description by both main parties, particularly regarding the porch addition. I have determined the appeal on the plans submitted.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The property sits on a road with similar aged and style properties, many of which appear to have been altered over time, including side and front extensions. Nevertheless there is feel of similarity. The character and

appearance of the area is defined by the similar property styles, set back from the road with gaps between plots, creating an open feel when viewed from the road with similar roof lines and roof types. The appeal property is semi detached and has been subject to more obvious alterations than those around it, including a roof light to the front and dormers to the side and rear. The previous alterations have created a clear break in rhythm and symmetry of appearance between the property and that of the adjoining, as well as from others nearby.

5. The development would change the current appearance of the property widening it to the side above the garage, but not the full width, partly wrapping around the rear at first floor with a single storey ground floor extension incorporating roof lights. The development also replaces an existing conservatory which is of markedly different style to the house. Policy H14 requires a gap of 1 metre between any first floor extension and the side boundary of the property, to avoid creating a terrace effect. Whilst a lesser gap is proposed the plans still achieve some gap to the boundary and a substantial gap to the main house of the adjacent property, which is a detached dwelling set back on a different alignment to the appeal property. Therefore, there would be no feel of terracing as a result of the development.
6. Therefore, the development accords with Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, 2019 which seeks to ensure well designed places and Saved Policy DG1 of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Local Plan, 2003 (Local Plan) which amongst other things seeks to achieve high quality design, improving the character and quality of the area. Whilst the development does not strictly comply with the 1 metre gap requirement set out in Saved Local Plan Policy H14, as no harm would arise in this regard in terms of terracing, I find no conflict with the development plan read a whole.
7. For the same reasons above, the proposal would accord with emerging policies SP2 and SP3 of the Borough Local Plan submission (2017) which amongst other things seek to ensure new development positively contributes to the area and is of a high quality design respectively.

Conditions

8. The Council has suggested the imposition of two conditions, besides the statutory implementation condition. A condition seeking matching materials is needed in the interests of appearance, whilst a condition requiring compliance with the approved plans is needed to achieve certainty.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons above the appeal is allowed.

M Scriven

INSPECTOR